DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 360 FL 017 074

AUTHOR McKeon, Denise
TITLE Different Types of ESL Programs. ERIC Digest.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 87
CONTRACT 400-86-0019
NOTE 4p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Enrollment Rate; Immersion Programs; Intensive Language Courses; Limited English Speaking; *Program Design; Resource Allocation; *Second Language Programs; Staff Utilization; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Content Area Teaching; *ERIC Digests

ABSTRACT

The organization of English as a second language (ESL) programs varies greatly, according to the student population, individual student characteristics, and district resources. They can be broadly categorized as either stand-alone ESL or ESL-plus. In general, stand-alone programs group limited-English-proficient (LEP) students together and instructs them in a manner similar to that used in foreign language classes. The program focus is primarily linguistic. ESL-plus programs may include a component of special instruction in and about English, but also provide content area instruction, in English or the first language. They generally occupy more or all of the instructional day. Stand-alone program types include pull-out programs, instruction during a regular class period, and a variation on the pull-out program bringing together students from a number of schools in a resource center. ESL-plus program types include bilingual education, structured immersion, sheltered English or content-based, and high-intensity language training programs. Choosing a program design for a given set of circumstances is complex, but the best program organization (1) is tailored to meet the students' linguistic, academic, and affective needs; (2) provides LEP students with the instruction necessary for progress through school at a rate similar to their native English-speaking peers; and (3) makes the best use of district and community resources. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289360

DIFFERENT TYPES OF ESL PROGRAMS

ERIC Digest

December 1987

Denise McKeon

ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
Washington, D.C.

FL017074

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. R. Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS

ERIC Digest

Different Types of ESL Programs

Prepared by Denise McKeon

December 1987

By the year 2000, it is anticipated that the number of limited–English–proficient (LEP) students aged 5–14 in the United States will reach approximately 3.4 million (Oxford, Pol, Lopez, Stupp, Gendell, & Peng, 1981). These are students who lack the necessary English skills for immediate success in an all–English curriculum. To date, nearly one teacher in four has had LEP students in class (O'Malley &Waggoner, 1984).

In an effort to meet the needs of these students, school districts have instituted a variety of programs that attempt to provide instruction in English as a second language (ESL). The organization of the programs appears to be as different as the students themselves. However, regardless of program design, the minimal goal of each program should be to provide each student with the English skills necessary to function successfully in an academic setting.

What Factors Influence the Design of ESL Programs?

Several variables influence the kind of program that will be designed to operate in any given district: (1) student population to be served, (2) individual student characteristics, and (3) district resources.

•*District Demographics.* Districts find themselves with many varieties of LEP students. Some districts have large, relatively stable populations of LEP students from a single language or cultural background. Others have large groups of LEP students representing several language backgrounds. Other districts may experience a sudden increase in the number of LEP students from a given group: the number of Vietnamese, Hmong, Cubans, and Haitians in many districts has increased significantly in direct response to social and political changes in students' countries of origin. Some districts have very small numbers of LEP students from many different language groups. Some report more than 100 language groups with two or three LEP students from each, scattered across grade levels and across schools. Characteristics of these populations—including the numbers and kinds of students per language group, the size of language groups and the mobility of their members, as well as geographic and grade distribution of students—influence the type of ESL instructional program design that a district will develop to serve its students.

•*Individual Student Characteristics.* Characteristics of individual students can influence the type of ESL instruction to be provided. Some students enter U.S. schools with strong academic preparation in their native language. They have attended school in their own country, have learned to read and write well in their first language and are at comparable (or better) levels in such content areas as mathematics. Other students may not have had such extensive academic preparation. Due to social, economic, or cultural factors, their schooling may have been interrupted or never begun (Ovando & Collier, 1985). Some students at every age level come with little or no exposure to reading and writing, unable in some instances to do even basic mathematical computations. The design of an instructional program to serve students such as these becomes an increasingly complex task.

•*District Resources.* Availability of resources varies from district to district. Some have trained ESL personnel on site, while others are scrambling to find someone who could work with a few students on a volunteer basis. Some districts can draw upon a large stable community group for bilingual personnel to staff immersion or bilingual education programs.

Some districts are experiencing declining enrollments, freeing up classroom space to allow for such designs as magnet schools or resource centers. Other districts are bursting at the seams, making it seem an impossibility just to find classroom space to house an ESL program. Thus, the capability of individual districts to provide human and material resources will greatly influence the type of ESL program organization that will be developed.

How Are Different ESL Programs Classified?

ESL program designs can be broadly categorized as either stand–alone ESL or ESL–plus. In general, stand–alone ESL programs group LEP students together and instruct them in a manner similar to that used in foreign language classes. The focus of the program is primarily a linguistic one. Stand–alone ESL programs operate solely for LEP students who are taken out of their regular classroom environment and placed in a setting where their need for instruction in and about English can be addressed in a special way (Ohio State Dept. of Education, 1987). The stand–alone ESL program usually operates for short portions of each school day, although in some less–than–ideal circumstances, it may operate less, with students receiving special instruction only two or three times a week.

ESL–plus programs may include a component of special instruction in and about English (like the stand–alone programs) but generally go beyond a linguistic scope to include a focus on content area instruction as well. Content area instruction may be given in the student's native language or in English. ESL–plus programs generally serve students for a longer portion of the instructional day than stand–alone programs, and in some instances represent the student's entire instructional program.

Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

What Are Some Examples of Stand–Alone ESL Program Design?

•**Pull–out**. Generally used in an elementary setting. The student is pulled out of the regular classroom for special instruction in ESL. This pull–out instruction may be provided by teachers who are assigned to just one building (where the number of students needing instruction is large enough), or it may be provided by one teacher who travels to several schools to serve small numbers of children scattered throughout the district (Chamot & Stewner–Manzanares, 1985). Students from different first-language backgrounds may be grouped for instruction. The teacher may or may not be trained in ESL (O'Malley & Waggoner, 1984) and is generally not bilingual.

•**Class period**. Generally used in a middle or secondary school setting. The student receives ESL instruction during a regular class period. Students generally receive credit for this course, just like any other course taken in a departmentalized setting. Students may be grouped according to their level of English proficiency. The teacher is generally not bilingual (Ohio State Dept. of Education, 1987).

•**Resource Center**. A variation of the pull–out design, the resource center brings students together from several classes or several schools. The resource center generally is an "enriched" version of the pull-out design with materials and staff being concentrated in one location to provide a wider variety of language instruction and experiences. Students may be pulled out of their regular classrooms for one or more periods of ESL instruction. The resource center is generally staffed with at least one full–time ESL teacher, who may or may not be bilingual (Ohio State Dept. of Education, 1987).

What Are Some Examples of English–Plus Program Design?

•**Bilingual Education Programs**. May be used either at the elementary or secondary level (Seelye & Navarro, 1977). Bilingual programs may be classified as "early transition" or "late transition" programs, depending on the criteria used to determine whether students can succeed in an all–English curriculum. In early exit programs, students are mainstreamed primarily on the basis of oral English proficiency. In "late transition" students are mainstreamed on the basis of English proficiency—including reading and writing—sufficient for sustaining academic achievement in an all–English classroom.

In both early and late transition programs, students receive instruction that develops their native language skills, instruction in ESL, and content area instruction in varying degrees in English or the first language. Students are grouped according to first language, and teachers are bilingual (Hernandez–Chavez, 1984).

•**Structured Immersion Programs**. May be used either in elementary or secondary schools. Immersion programs include, in varying degrees, development of the student's first language skills and content area instruction in English. No structured ESL component is included. While students may address the teacher in either their first language or English, teachers (who are bilingual) respond generally in English. Content area instruction is based on the notion of "comprehensible input," in which the teacher uses only the vocabulary and structures that can be understood by the students (Ramirez, 1986).

•**Sheltered English or Content–Based Programs.** Used primarily to date with secondary school students. These "alternative" content classes allow LEP speakers from different backgrounds with some English proficiency to be grouped into specific content classes especially designed to provide them with "comprehensible input" (see previous section on Immersion Programs). A trained ESL teacher who is not necessarily bilingual provides instruction. Sheltered English or content–based programs may parallel virtually all mainstream academic curricular offerings or may consist of only one or two subjects (Chamot & Stewner–Manzanares, 1985).

•**High Intensity Language Training (HILT) Programs.** Used primarily at the secondary level. In a HILT design, LEP students of various language backgrounds are grouped for a significant portion of the school day. Students receive intensive training in ESL, usually for 3 hours a day in the first year of instruction, less in succeeding years (Chamot & Stewner–Manzanares, 1985). Placement of students into regular classrooms is accomplished on a subject–by–subject basis and usually includes initial mainstreaming into linguistically undemanding classes such as music, physical education, and art. Some HILT models may incorporate content–based or sheltered English classes as an additional feature of program design. Teachers are trained in ESL and are not necessarily bilingual.

Is There Any One Best Program Design to Use with LEP Students?

The design of any ESL program must take so many factors into account that it becomes a fairly complex task to decide which program organization would be best in any given set of circumstances. What can be said, however, is that the best program organization is one which:

–is tailored to meet the linguistic, academic, and affective needs of students;

–provides LEP students with the instruction necessary to allow them to progress through school at a rate commensurate with their native–English speaking peers; and

–makes the best use of district and community resources.

References

Chamot, A.U., & Stewner–Manzanares, G. (1985). *A summary of current literature on English as a second language. Part C Research Agenda*. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 539)

Hernandez–Chavez, E. (1984). The inadequacy of English immersion education as an educational approach for language minority students in the United States. In *Studies on immersion education*. Sacramento, CA: California State Dept. of Education.

Ohio State Dept. of Education. (1987). *Strategies for developing language programs for national origin minority students* (rev. ed.). Columbus, OH: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 034)

O'Malley, J.M., & Waggoner, D. (1984). Public school teacher preparation and the teaching of ESL. *TESOL Newsletter, 18*(3), 1, 18-22.

Ovando, C.J., & Collier, V.P. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oxford, R., Pol, L., Lopez, D., Stupp, P., Gendell, M., & Peng, S. (1981). Projections of non–English background and limited–English–proficient persons in the United States to the year 2000: Educational planning in the demographic context. *NABE Journal, 5*(3), 1-30.

Ramirez, J.D. (1986). Comparing structured English immersion and bilingual education: First year results of national study. *American Journal of Education, 95*(1), 122-49.

Seelye, H.N. & Navarro, B.N. (1977). *A guide to the selection of bilingual education program designs*. Arlington Heights, IL: Bilingual Education Service Center.

This report was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400–86–0019. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or ED.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement ***U. S. Department of Education***